

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**DWAYNE FRANKS, # 742054**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**RICK THALER, DIRECTOR TDCJ-  
CID,**

**Respondent.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-1689-O**

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND  
DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case on March 13, 2012. Petitioner submitted a letter to the Court requesting that his fourteen-day period for filing objections begin on March 23, 2012. *See generally* ECF No. 19. The Court has afforded Petitioner more than fourteen days from March 23, 2012 to file his objections, but Petitioner has filed none. Nevertheless, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the proposed findings and recommendation and finds that the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge are correct. Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge as the findings of the Court.

Based on the foregoing, Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are **DISMISSED** with prejudice as barred by the one-year limitation period, and Petitioner's remaining claims are **DENIED**.

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 proceedings, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c),

the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the petitioner has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).<sup>1</sup>

In the event, the petitioner will file a notice of appeal, the court notes that

- ( ) the petitioner will proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.
- (X ) the petitioner will need to pay the \$455.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

**SO ORDERED** on this **18th day of April, 2012.**

  
Reed O'Connor  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 Cases, as amended effective on December 1, 2009, reads as follows:

(a) Certificate of Appealability. The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22. A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

(b) Time to Appeal. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability.